

REMARKS

[0011] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-27, 29 and 30 are currently pending
- No claims are canceled herein
- No claims are withdrawn herein
- Claims 1, 19, are 26 amended herein
- No claims are added herein

[0012] Support for the amendments to 1, 19, and 26 is found in the specification at least at page 32, line 20 to page 33, line 2 and page 38, lines 1-5.

Cited Documents

[0013] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- *Russell: Russell et al.*, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0039964
- *Chinnici: Chinnici et al.*, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0191803
- *Ernst*, Ernst et al., U.S. Patent Application 2003/0182308
- *Albornoz: Albornoz et al.*, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0154978

Claims 1-8, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 26, 27 and 29-30 Are Non-Obvious Over

Russell in view of Chinnici

[0014] Claims 1-8, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 26, 27 and 29-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Russell in view of Chinnici. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 1

[0015] In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 1 is moot. Specifically, Russell does not teach or suggest the claimed, “decomposing another object of the computer readable objects and being of an unknown object type, including keeping a property of the object of the unknown object type as a property bag.”

[0016] Claim 1 recites in part, “decomposing another object of the computer readable objects and being of an unknown object type, including keeping a property of the object of the unknown object type as a property bag.” The Office cites Russell paragraph 0063 as teaching decomposing an object of the computer-readable objects (Office Action, page 5.) Russell describes that:

Referring again to FIG. 5, the process of serializing a bean at run time will now be described in more detail. The invocation of the run-time serializer at 510 is preferably triggered by receipt of a request message that is intercepted as it is transmitted along the network path from a client to a server, where this message contains a complex object 500 that needs to be serialized ...The proxy preferably uses a prior art filtering process to determine

which messages should be intercepted. Typical filtering techniques include monitoring traffic for occurrence of one or more predetermined target Uniform Resource Locators ("URLs"), for particular document types contained in the request messages, for particular device types at the sending client, or for particular content types specified in the request messages (Russell paragraph 0063).

[0017] Thus, Russell describes that the complex object which needs to be serialized is one of a particular document type, a particular device type, or a particular content type as specified in the request message, that is the complex is of a known type. Accordingly, Russell fails to teach decomposing another object of the computer readable objects and being of an unknown object type, including keeping a property of the object of the unknown object type as a property bag.

[0018] Moreover, Chinnici also fails to teach the subject recital of claim 1. Instead, Chinnici describes that each member is serialized by invoking the serialize method on an appropriate, or known, serializer (Chinnici, paragraph 0154). Thus, Chinnici describes an appropriate serializer for each member. It necessarily follows from the serializer being known that the Chinnici members have a known type. Accordingly, Chinnici fails to disclose decomposing another object of the computer readable objects and being of an unknown object type, including keeping a property of the object of the unknown object type as a property bag

[0019] Consequently, the proposed combination of Russell and Chinnici does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Moreover, neither Ernst nor Albornoz are cited for or cure the foregoing deficiencies of the

proposed combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2-8, 11, 13, 14, 16, and 17

[0020] Claims 2-8, 11, 13, 14, 16, and 17 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 2-8, 11, 13, 14, 16, and 17 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of the subject claims be withdrawn.

Claims 26 and 27

[0021] For reasons similar to the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 26 and 27 are allowable over the proposed combination of Russell and Chinnici. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of the subject claims be withdrawn.

**Claims 15 and 18-25 Are Non-Obvious Over Russell and Chinnici
further in view of Albornoz**

[0022] Claims 15 and 18-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Russell and Chinnici further in view of Albornoz. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 19

[0023] In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 19 is moot. Specifically, the proposed combination of Russell, Chinnici, and Albornoz does not teach or suggest the claimed, “when the identified type is an unknown object type, responding to the determining, wherein the responding comprises instantiating a second object and populating at least one property of the second object with information obtained from within the serialized package.”

[0024] Claim 19 recites in part, “when the identified type is an unknown object type, responding to the determining, wherein the responding comprises instantiating a second object and populating at least one property of the second object with information obtained from within the serialized package.”

[0025] First, Applicant submits that the foregoing remarks regarding Russell, Chinnici, and Ernst apply with equal weight here.

[0026] Secondly, Applicants respectfully submit that Albornoz fails to cure the deficiencies of Russell and Chinnici. More particularly, the Office cites Albornoz,

paragraph 0031 as teaching serialization of objects within an XML data structure API class (Office Action, page 13). However, Albornoz describes serialization of objects in which the iteration of sub-objects is performed in the order specified by the parsed XML schema description data structure that is associated with this XML data structure API object in order to ensure conformity with the data element order specified in the XML schemas (Albornoz, paragraph 0031).

[0027] Thus, Albornoz describes serialization of objects in conformity with the data order element order specified in an XML schema. Since the Albornoz serialization must be conformity with a schema, Albornoz teaches schemas which must be known in order for the serialization to be in conformity therewith. As a result, Albornoz fails to teach serialization of objects of unknown types. It necessarily follows therefore, that Albornoz also fails to teach the claimed “when the identified type is an unknown object type, responding to the determining, wherein the responding comprises instantiating a second object and populating at least one property of the second object with information obtained from within the serialized package.”

[0028] Consequently, the proposed combination of Russell, Chinnici, and Albornoz does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 20-25

[0029] Claims 20-25 ultimately depend from independent claim 19. As discussed above, claim 19 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 20-25 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of the subject claims.

Dependent Claims 15 and 18

[0030] Claims 15 and 18 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 15 and 18 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of the subject claims.

Conclusion

[0031] Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Robert L. Villhard/

Dated: July 28, 2009

Robert L. Villhard(bob@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162 x5005)
Registration No. 53725

Reviewer/Supervisor: *Robert C. Peck* (robp@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019)
Registration No. 56826